

Appl. No. 10/797,842  
Amdt. Dated February 3, 2006  
Reply to Office action of October 3, 2005

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 2-4. Reference numbers 4', 6' and 7 have been added in order to identify the claimed features "4':underside," "6':dead stop" and "7:clip" respectively. These sheets replace the original sheets including Figs. 1-4.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner requests correction of the specification. The arrangement of the specification including all the section headings has been corrected according to 37 CFR 1.77(b).

The Examiner requests to use proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure. The abstract has been amended to more clearly and concisely describe the claimed invention in the format in compliance with 37 CFR 1.72.

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). Figs 3 and 4 have been amended to add a reference number "7" in order to identify the claimed feature "clip." Reference numbers "4" and "6" also have been added to Figs 2-4 in order to identify the disclosed or claimed features "underside" and "dead stop" respectively.

Claims 1-9 are objected to because of the informalities. Claims 1-5 and 9 have been amended to correct informalities. The Examiner states that claim 8 fails to further limit a previous claim. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 8 defines the material of the shells of the parent claim and therefore does not fail to further limit a previous claim.

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brander (U.S. Patent No. 4,272,591). For at least the following reasons, the Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed. Brander does not describe each and every feature as required in claim 1.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a cap insertable from the inside to the outside of a housing through an opening. The amendment is supported by the original specification, for example, on page 3, lines 15-20 and Figs. 1-4. Brander does not disclose the cap insertable from the inside to the outside of the housing through the opening and pins insertable into grooves from

the inside of the housing and jammed from being pulled outside of the housing by dead stops as recited in claim 1. In the application, the cap is insertable from the inside to the outside of the housing through the opening, and the pins are insertable into the grooves from the inside of the housing in order to restrict the cap from loosening and coming out of the housing. In Brander, a battery door is merely inserted from the outside of the housing, and there is no function to restrict the door from loosening and coming out (See Figs 1, 3-4 and 7 of Brander). Brander does not disclose grooves and dead stops that jam pins of the cap from being pulled outside of the housing as required in amended claim 1. Thus, Brander does not anticipate claim 1. The remaining claims in this application directly or indirectly depend on claim 1, and thus are patentable for at least the same reasons as the parent claim.

Claims 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brander. For at least the following reasons, the Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed. Brander does not teach or suggest all features of the claimed invention.


As mentioned above, Brander does not describe each and every feature as required in amended claim 1. In particular, Brander does not disclose the cap insertable from the inside to the outside of the housing through the opening and the pins insertable into the grooves from the inside of the housing and jammed from being pulled outside of the housing by the dead stops as required in amended claim 1. Because Brander does not teach or suggest each and every feature set forth in claim 1, claims 7 and 8, which depend from claim 1, do not be rendered obvious by Brander. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned agent to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same  
to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 36551.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By:   
Tomoko Ishihara, Reg. No. 56808

1801 East 9th Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700

Date: February 3, 2006